

to the Law Chancellor to ask if he will take steps to bring on an anti-censorship registerial law known as so-called "censorship" laws, such as those in which you and your fellow members of the West have so actively participated.

Yours faithfully,

NO/DAW/DP

16th January, 1981.

Reginald Parkhouse, Esq., J.P.,
Exeter Magistrates' Court,
Heavitree Road,
Exeter,
EX1 2LF.

Dear Mr. Parkhouse,

Regina v. Spokes

Your decision to rule the book "Pornography or Art?", by Poul Gerhard, "obscene", in giving judgement in the recent case against Mr. Peter Spokes, together with copies of such magazines as "Mayfair", "Men Only" and "Penthouse", is as outrageous as it is absurd.

In interpreting the 1959 Obscene Publications Acts, you were required to determine whether or not such publications, taken as a whole, would tend to deprave and corrupt persons who are likely, having regard to all relevant circumstances, to read or see them. Notwithstanding that a purely objective judgement in any such cases is, in my opinion and that of countless far wiser heads than mine, quite impossible, you saw fit, in your infinite wisdom, to order the destruction of reproductions of works by Pablo Picasso, Aubrey Beardsley and other such eminent artists of acclaimed international repute.

The citizens of Exeter may thus have been deprived of such delights, but, for your information and, I trust, enlightenment, Londoners are still able to obtain copies of Mr. Gerhard's excellent book, quite openly, as I did only yesterday, and I am sure that both Mr. Gerhard and the bookshop where I purchased it will be most grateful to you and your colleagues, for affording the publication so much valuable free publicity and thereby substantially boosting its sales.

The kind of magisterial decision which you made in this case, bordering as it does on the lunatic, makes ~~it even more~~ still, if that were possible, the urgent need for radical changes in the ridiculous, repressive and out-moded censorship laws in this country. We of the N.C.R.O.P.A. will militate, without quarter, for such changes relentlessly. We are having a personal meeting with the Home Secretary on 21st January to discuss just such changes. We shall certainly cite the case against Mr. Spokes as a classic example of the idiocy of the present legislation at that meeting. Meantime I am writing

...../continued

